



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/572,670	03/20/2006	Asa Elisabeth Gladwin	PB60517	4600
20462	7590	09/04/2008	EXAMINER	
SMITHKLINE BEECHAM CORPORATION CORPORATE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY-US, UW2220 P. O. BOX 1539 KING OF PRUSSIA, PA 19406-0939			BERNHARDT, EMILY B	
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1624				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
09/04/2008		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

US_cipkop@gsk.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/572,670	Applicant(s) GLADWIN, ASA ELISABETH
	Examiner EMILY BERNHARDT	Art Unit 1624

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 June 2008.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 18-37 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 18-37 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SSE/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6/2/08

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: _____

In view of applicants' response filed on 6/2/08 the following applies.

Claims 19-22 and 24-27 and 29-32 and 34-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

1. It is still not seen how claims 19-22 further limit the scope of claim 18 or how 24-27 further limit the scope of 23 or how claims 29-32 further limit the scope of 28 or how 34-37 further limit the scope of 33. The recitation of alternate characterization data in main claim 18 from a reading of the specification is reciting one and the same thing. There is no discussion of purity differences. Taking samples from the same batch of isolated purified compound to run IR,X-ray,etc. analyses does not change the nature of the compound. Applicants do not state how these claims differ in scope for infringement purposes.

Claims 18-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. Isolation and recovery/purification steps **have been deleted** from Description

4. This compound is the immediate precursor for making final product claimed herein. Unless this compound is otherwise known in the literature or commercially available prior to applicants' filing date, there appears to be no basis for assuming that one skilled in the art would be able to deduce the necessary steps needed to isolate and purify the

compound. Note the following passage in *In re Howarth* 210 USPQ 689 at p.690: "Applicants' risk in leaving anything out of his application...burden rests upon applicant who chooses to rely upon general knowledge in art to render his disclosure enabling to establish that those of ordinary skill in the art can be expected to possess or know where to obtain this knowledge;" . Thus the claims rejected fail to comply with "how to make" requirement.

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 18-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ahmed for reasons of record. The examiner has agreed that egs.51 and 52 are different than the form claimed herein. Thus presenting side-by-side data for these forms does not address the thrust of the rejection which was a needed comparison of eg.16 vs claimed form. In the absence of such persuasive data this rejection must be maintained. See a discussion of the case law previously cited. The composition claims are also rejected for the same reason as the remaining claims. The examiner is no longer relying on the argument that liquid carriers are covered. Note *Exxon Chemical products v. Lubrizol Corp.* 35 USPQ2d 1801.

The rejection under 35 USC 103 is withdrawn upon review of the specific isolation conditions employed in the working examples and the lack of a generic teaching to vary such.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Emily Bernhardt whose telephone number is 571-272-0664.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the acting supervisor for AU 1624, James O. Wilson can be reached at 571-272-0661. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Emily Bernhardt/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit
1624

Application/Control Number: 10/572,670
Art Unit: 1624

Page 6